DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 494 EA 006 358

AUTHOR Freeman, Jeanne
TITLE A Burkean Analysis of the Classroom.
PUB DATE 17 Apr 74
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting (59th, Chicago, Illinois, April 15-19, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Environment; *Classroom Research; *Curriculum Research; *Educational Research; Learning Processes; *Literary Criticism; Models; Self Actualization; Socialization
IDENTIFIERS Burke (Kenneth)

ABSTRACT

A promising area in educational research is the application of techniques of literary criticism to curriculum theory. Kenneth Burke's dramatistic system clarifies the five sources of motives in the drama--purpose, agency, scene, agent, and act. This pentad creates a possibly fruitful model that highlights the drama of the classroom. Contrasting three long recognized orientations in education--knowledge transmission, socialization, self actualization--with Burke's taxonomy highlights the ways in which the three frames of reference shape various dramatic situations. This dramatistic interpretation provides additional perspectives that appear to clarify and enrich analysis of the educational process. (Author)

ED 094494

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A BURKEAN ANALYSIS OF THE CLASSROOM

Jeanne Freeman
The University of Texas at Austin

Statistical investigations dominate the educational scene today; however, it is clear that humanistic theories should coexist with empirical systems as contexts for inquiry into the educational process. Mann (1969) and Westbury (1970) have noted that curriculum evaluation could be expanded with the addition of the concepts, methodologies, and strategies of other fields. A promising theoretical area is rhetorical and literary criticism. For example, Kelly (1973) recently demonstrated that the models of literary criticism provide fruitful analogies for curriculum evaluation. However, no thorough application of literary theory has been used by curriculum theorists or researchers.

One of the most important literary and rhetorical critics of the twentieth century is Kenneth Burke. In his Grammar of Motives (1969), Burke generates a dramatistic theory which is a philosophical attempt to classify a dynamic view of reality in terms of human interaction. Burke's dramatistic theory has had an impact beyond the circles of literary critics. Burke and other scholars have applied this model to analyze the varieties of literary criticism itself and to philosophical systems in general.

In his dramatistic theory Burke isolates five sources of motive in the drama: Purpose (why it is done); Agency (how it is done); Scene (when or where it is done); Agent (who does it) and Act (what is done). Both the overall curriculum viewed

---

1. Paper prepared for delivery at the American Educational Research Association Conference, Chicago, Illinois, April 17, 1974

2. The author acknowledges with appreciation the assistance of James Kinneavy and Roland Huff.

EA 006 358

macroscopically and the classroom, a smaller component viewed microscopically, may be conceived as dramatic situations. Applying Burke's pentad of motives to both the macrocosm of the curriculum and the microcosm of the classroom throws into view the inherent drama of the educational process. The focus of this paper is the application of Burke's taxonomy to education by contrasting three major trends in curriculum development and their impact on the classroom.

Three contemporary curricular theories in education shape very different dramas in the classroom and emerge as the sources of distinct educational goals: one theory views education as a means of transmitting the cultural heritage to students; a second theory views education as a means of socializing the individual; a third theory views education as a means of self-actualizing the child. (Tyler, 1950; Beauchamp, 1968) The first theory emphasizes the mastery of the academic disciplines, the second is primarily concerned with behavioral change, and the third places a premium upon the self-actualization of the unique individual. All of Burkes five motives operate in any classroom drama, but depending upon the curricular theory which generates the motives of that drama, three markedly different dramas emerge. Contrasting the features of the different educational dramas requires a careful analysis of the degree and ways in which each of the five elements of the Burkean Pentad interact in each of the classrooms fashioned by the three curricular philosophies.

Each curriculum theory generates curricula that can be conceived as plans or documents, designed to achieve curricular goals. (Beauchamp, 1968) This analogy enables us to use rhetorical techniques of discourse analysis to study the curriculum macroscopically as a document in which the five motives converge. Thus, in Burkean terms curriculum can be conceived as a set of five basic motivational forces: a curriculum guide (Burke's act), authored by curriculum designers (Burke's agent) to serve as a motivational ground (Burke's scene) for

subsequent actions, thereby an instrument (Burke's agency) for shaping human relations (Burke's purpose.) A curriculum is one type of human drama which can be dramatistically interpreted. Given this interpretation of educational components, it can be seen that the principles and assumptions underlying the curriculum establish a calculus of motives, and these five sources of motives in Burke's heirarchy can be viewed as a dynamic interplay of forces--a drama.

Within the drama, the purposes or educational orientations largely determine why the action takes place. Curriculum becomes the necessary means (agency) to attain these specific curricular goals. Therefore, the curriculum sets the stage for the classroom situation, itself only a part of the larger curriculum drama. And the classroom situation, like the larger curriculum drama, can also be interpreted in dramatistic terms.

Because different goals and means contrast sharply in curriculum, the subsequent classroom situations differ. The classroom serves as the scene within which the drama is enacted. Logically then the actors and acts are the necessary components of the plot--as Burke says they are congruent with the scene. The ways in which the teachers and students (agents) influence and are influenced by the scene depends on the degree of freedom or control exerted by the scene. For Burke the agents' verbal acts become the focus of the dramatistic analysis. These verbal acts give form and style to the drama. The complex interplay of the five motives serves as a framework for analysis of the classroom drama.[3] The application of the Burkean theory to the overall curriculum model and the overall classroom model can be seen graphically in Figure I.

As can be seen in the upper right corner of Figure I, each of the three

3. Frymier (1967) develops a metaphor in which curriculum includes actors, artifacts, and operations. He expands this metaphor to explain how curriculum builds an environment for the learner and defines the interactive relationships, thus enlarging his metaphor to include Burke's scene. The parallels between the two systems are fairly evident.

curricular aims generates a particular educational orientation. MacDonald (1973) comments that these three value-laden orientations constitute biases in point of view that prescribe specific values in curriculum and classroom decisions. In Permanence and Change (1965) Burke explores the ramifications of a particular orientation or point of view and its determining influence upon a general belief system. He concludes that an orientation (purpose) determines expectations and future choices and thereby patterns future actions. The terminology of language that surrounds the specific orientation shapes the ways in which people understand reality and consequently the ways they act. Translating Burke into the evaluation of curriculum, each curricular theory generates a different form of classroom drama. The ways in which each of the five motives of the Burkean pentad are embodied in the different classroom dramas are schematized in Figure II.

The first curriculum theory--the intellectual discipline orientation--holds that education serves to impart the content and skills of the organized fields of knowledge which have their own histories, principles, and methodologies. (Bruner, 1962; Foshay, 1961) In the sixties, this philosophy set in motion curriculum projects that continue to pervade schools (e.g. PSSC Physics; SMSG Mathematics, New Criticism, New Linguistics, New Rhetoric). Considered chiefly as subject matter, curriculum functions as an instrument that shapes the scene of the classroom environment. In a dramatic context this orientation gives the starring role to the agency. Content, specifically the disciplines translated into school subjects, is the major focus for activities in the classroom. Concepts and principles that structure the subjects are major considerations for scholars who organize bodies of knowledge to make curricular plans that constitute the content, methods, and materials that should train students in the structure and methods of the discipline. This primacy of content places certain limitations on the classroom scene.

Transported into the classroom, such a view of curriculum creates a highly structured scene. The environment must be a carefully organized and sequenced arrangement of materials, facilities, and activities that provide the necessary background for transmitting the appropriate knowledge. Within this context actors are consistent with the scene; therefore, teachers and students act out restricted roles as disseminators and receptors of information or as "scholars." Bruner (1962) typically defines the teacher's role as a communicator of knowledge and a model of competence. He goes on to define students' role as young scholars who master the principles of the disciplines and the skills and attitudes of discovery that will enable them to develop their intellectual powers. This emphasis on knowledge limits students' abilities to express other dimensions of their personalities. For example, verbal actions in this context center on informative or exploratory discourse, to employ terms used by Kinneavy (1971) and Reuckert (1963) The teacher uses informative language through lectures and demonstrations or uses exploratory discourse through key questions to guide student inquiry. Students respond to the teacher's cues by asking questions or answering questions focused on a specific topic. Major tasks for students are to clarify the ideas and to perform the necessary skills. Because informative discourse dominates the language, actors minimally experiment with the persuasive, personal, or aesthetic features of language. Dramatistically, this impersonal, structured context can reduce the vitality and richness of the actions by depersonalizing the actors. Curriculum designed around the intellectual disciplines molds a very structured scene in which actors have narrowly defined roles.

Responding to the limitations of this context, Foshay (1970) and Bruner (1971) modified their positions. They considered how the subject matter curriculum had neglected the child's full personality, by excluding the emotional, social, and aesthetic dimensions. Consequently, a new trend has emerged to revamp the academic

curriculum. In this movement, subject matter is considered in terms of inter-disciplinary themes that integrate knowledge. Also students' needs have become a major factor influencing the curriculum; this trend may create more active and creative roles for students and teachers. This shift toward a more dynamic view of education may permit more possibilities in the classroom drama. The scholarly curriculum is evolving toward a plan which is less prescriptive and narrow and more responsive to the wishes and needs of students. This metamorphosis places many subject-minded curriculum designs closer to the new progressive domain and closer to the second focus, observed in the purposes in Figure I.

The second theory--the self-actualizing orientation--holds that education should develop and fulfill the individual student's talents, needs, interests, and abilities. (Combs, 1962; Rogers, 1971; Frymier, 1967) In a more student centered curriculum, the needs and wishes of the students are the major foci of the curriculum; therefore, this framework features the agent. Interpreted dramatistically in this phenomenological view of curriculum, actors are perceived as purposefully acting on their environment through their sensibilities, intuitions, understanding, and reason. (Burke, 1969) To permit actors fuller participation in their environment, curriculum unfolds as an open system that is comprehensive, organized, flexible, democratic, and purposeful. (Frymier, 1967; Wilson, 1971) In contrast to the subject-matter curriculum, content, organization, methodologies, and activities are designed to suit students' needs. Curriculum designers determine the appropriateness and effectiveness of varied materials, resources, and strategies as they contribute to a more flexible environment with more personal methods. As a plan, this curriculum offers open possibilities for the scene. agents, and acts.

The scene in this framework is an "open lab" of self discovery. (Combs 1962)

Fluid space, flexible timing, varied resources, and diverse interactions characterize the environment. (Wilson, 1971; Combs, 1962) The context provides a dynamic scene in which actors can experiment in and explore a rich, varied environment. The scene serves as a background for the actors who dominate the drama by exploring, manipulating, and modifying their environment. As an example, MacDonald (1973) perceives the classroom as a complex social setting where individual variations in motivations, values experiences, aptitudes, and behaviors require more than simple, scientific evaluation. He suggests that educational motives and objectives should emerge from the classroom context, and that curriculum makers may learn more observing the dynamics of the classroom than by imposing objectives on the classroom. New progressive educators and humanistic psychologists consider the complex interaction of motives in the classroom.

The actors in this open-lab drama play active and creative roles in fashioning the scene. For Eisner (1963), the teacher is both scientist and artist. The qualitative aspects of teaching permit the teacher to generate a learning environment out of the students' authentic needs and interests, and structure the overall direction of the group's education in the evolution of the learning environment. The goal for the teacher is to expand and intensify students' experiences. In humanistic psychological terminology, the teacher is a craftsman who through empathy, openess, and understanding creates a rich, varied, open, safe, growth climate for students. (Combs, 1962; Rogers, 1971) Teaching becomes partly an art in which the teacher can play a major role in facilitating and maintaining a dynamic environment for students, thereby enhancing the intensity and complexity of the drama.

In contrast to the intellectual discipline orientation which features informative language, this drama emphasizes expressive discourse. Attention to values, feelings, goals, and personal meanings encourages students to explore and to express themselves, so students can experience the personal and subjective. In this open scene with a wide variety of roles, actors exercise a broad range of acts, including informing,

persuading, expressing, or creating. (Burke, 1969; Kinneavy, 1971) Each act generates new acts and new discoveries that the student may incorporate into his self picture: language becomes an instrument for discovering the self, others, and the world. Through multiple uses of language, the student can evolve a unique style that expresses himself. The dynamism of this environment depends on the delicate balance of control and freedom shared by the actors. Whether improvised or planned the open classroom provides rich possibilities in the classroom drama, a contrast to the final view which we will consider.

The third theory--the behavior control orientation--holds that education serves to control the student and shape him into a socially acceptable product. (Skinner, 1971) This view creates a technology of behavior designed to condition the individual by scientifically controlling and shaping his environment. Therefore, the behavioristic theory and terminology feature the scene. This curriculum revolves around what Arthur Brown (1973) calls the Performance based/Competency/Accountability/Behavioral objective movement. This curriculum includes precise, measureable objectives, scientifically based models, and procedural control designed to guarantee the objectives. (Popham 1970; Zifferblatt, 1973) Efficiency and effectiveness are the major goals. The curriculum becomes a vast behavioral system in which all operations such as media, teaching behavior, physical environment, strategies, motives, and time become contingency arrangements in the system. (Zifferblatt, 1973) This systematically planned curriculum predetermines the classroom scene.

The classroom scene evolves into an "applied laboratory" or "planned environment" in which all contingency situations are programmed. (Krasner and Krasner, 1973; Zifferblatt, 1973) This scientific environment can be pictured with the appropriate props--self instructional packets, teaching machines, and tokens. (Krasner and Krasner, 1973; Staats; 1973) The scene is completely staged for the actors. The

teacher performs a single role as behavior modifier whose primary function is to control and shape behavior. (Nuthall, 1973) By eliciting and reinforcing students' responses, the teacher patterns the actions in the classroom. As an actor, the teacher chooses among preset alternatives, using prescribed techniques to effect the proper social and intellectual behaviors. The students act out the prescribed behaviors, playing roles as passive respondents to the teacher's stimuli and reinforcers. By programming students' actions, the teacher reduces the richness of the possible drama.

In behaviorally controlled classroom drama, the verbal actions are predominantly persuasive. The teacher focuses on the students in an attempt to elicit specific emotions, thoughts, or actions. Stylistically, persuasive language stresses the imperative: "In Seat, Face Front, Raise Hand, Work, Pay Attention, Desk Clear..." (Krasner and Krasner, 1973) The language is clear, precise and brief. The repetition and consistency of rules, procedures, and reinforcers reflect the persuasive feature of language. (Kinneavy, 1971) Using gimmicks, such as tokens reinforces the persuasive language. Burke (1965) explains how the behavioristic terminology exerts control over the natural and poetic means of communication. As a literary critic, Burke describes the behavioristic drama as being so mechanical that the actors are reduced to mere organisms and the acts to sheer motion. As a psychologist, Maddi (1972) notes how strict behaviorism makes little attempt to understand the complex phenomena of human behavior.

The cognitive-social learning view is a promising area in the behavioristic camp that may enrich this orientation. Mischell (1973) reviews the research that explores the complex interaction of the person and the situation. In this research, psychologists investigate both how the person affects the situation and how the situation functions psychologically. This view combines the phenomenologists' concern for a person's motives, thoughts, feelings, and wishes and the behaviorists' concern with the controlling conditions in the environment. Mischell notes how

complex social settings vary in the degree to which they prescribe and limit the range of acceptable behavior for persons in particular roles and settings. The narrow limitations that schools can impose on students' roles and behaviors may awaken educators to the richer possibilities inherent in the classroom drama. Such a reawakening might move the behaviorist's bias closer to the humanist's orientation.

The voices calling for a rapprochement of behaviorism and humanism are legion. A synthesis of the basic philosophy and goals of the humanists and the principles and techniques of the behaviorists promises to regenerate the scientific method. Because both camps are concerned with helping the person experience life more positively, Thoresen (1973) concludes that a synthesis of these perspectives draws from a variety of sources and avoids "invidious dichotomies." Such a merger opens avenues to gathering data and offers a better understanding of the educational process.

Each of the three curricular trends is evolving more humanistic and more complex insights into the educational process. But each tends to retain a certain polarized bias and cliché image: "for scholars only," "for touchy-feely people only," or "for operant conditioners only." Burke offers a corrective alternative--an artistic orientation--that may supplement the other orientations. Because curriculum helps shape the lives of students by preordaining a vast array of experiences, the curriculum largely defines the classroom drama--the purposes, scene, agency, actors, and actions. Burke's dramatistic metaphor offers a way of looking at the dynamics of human interaction and promises to frame the educational drama in the context of more sensitive and aesthetic perspectives. The complexity of the classroom drama should stimulate a philosophy of education that evolves from a cross fertilization of the sciences and the arts.

FIGURE I

BURKE'S DRAMATISTIC THEORY--THE PENTAD	MACROSCOPIC CURRICULUM	MICROSCOPIC CLASSROOM
Purpose (Why it is done)	Three Sources of Curricular Goals Knowledge- Intellectual Disciplines Child- New Progressive Education Humanistic Psychology Society- Behavioristic Education and Psychology	
Agency (How it is done)	Legal and publication agencies of universities, school districts, state department of instruction, etc.	Curriculum
Scene (When or where it is done)	Universities, school districts state offices, district offices.	Classroom
Agent (Who does it)	Curriculum Designers	Teachers and Students
Act (What is done)	Curriculum Guide	Verbal and Non-verbal Acts

FIGURE II

The Interplay of the Five Motives in Three Educational Contexts

	INTELLECTUAL DISCIPLINES	CHILD CENTERED	BEHAVIORISTIC
Purpose	KNOWLEDGE	CHILD	BEHAVIOR CONTROL
Agency	CURRICULUM	curriculum	Curriculum
Scene	classroom	classroom "Open Lab of Self Discovery"	CLASSROOM "Applied Laboratory" "Planned Environment"
Agents	teacher and students	TEACHERS AND STUDENTS	teacher and students
Acts	Scientific and Informative discourse	EXPRESSIVE and p rsuasive, informative, and aesthetic discourse	Persuasive discourse

References

Avila, Donald and Purkey, William. "Self Theory and Behaviorism: A Rapproachement." Psychology in the Schools. 9:124-5; April 1972.

Beauchamp, George A. Curriculum Theory. Wilmette, Illinois: The Kagg Press, 1968.

Bellack, Arno. "Foundations of General Education in the High School" in Arno A. Bellack (Ed.) What Shall the High Schools Teach? Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1956 Yearbook, Washington, D. C., 1956.

Brown, Arthur. "What Could Be Bad: Some Reflections on the Accountability Movement" English Journal 62: 461-4; March 1973.

Bruner, Jerome. The Process of Education. New York: Vintage Books, 1963.

Bruner, Jerome. "The Process of Education Revisited, " Phi Delta Kappan. 53: 18-21; September, 1971.

Burke, Kenneth. A Grammar of Motives. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1969.

Burke, Kenneth. Permanence and Change. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc, 1965.

Combs, Arthur W. Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming. Association for Supervision for Curriculum Development, 1962 Yearbook, Washington, D. C., 1962.

Eisner, Elliott. "Persistent Dilemmas in Curriculum Decision Making" in Elliott Eisner (Ed.) Confronting Curriculum Reform. Boston:Little, Brown and Company, 1971. pp. 162-74.

Eisner, Elliott. "Qualitative Intelligence and the Act of Teaching" in The Elementary School Journal 63: 299-307; March 1963.

Foshay, Arthur. "A Modest Proposal" in Educational Leadership 18:506-516; May, 1961.

Foshay, Arthur. Curriculum for the Seventies: An Agenda For Invention. Washington: National Education Association. Center for Study of Instruction, 1970.

Frymier, Jack R. "Around and Around the Curriculum Bush or In Quest of a Curriculum Theory." A paper presented at the meeting of Professors of Curriculum, Dallas, Texas, 1967.

Kelly, Edward F. "Curriculum Evaluation and Literary Criticism: The Explication of an Analogy." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, 1973.

Kinneavy, James L. A Theory of Discourse. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.

Krasner, Leonard and Krasner, Miriam. "Token Economies and Other Planned Environments" in Carl E. Thoresen (Ed.) Behavior Modification in Education. Seventy-second Yearbook of National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1973. pp. 351-384.

MacDonald, James B. "Educational Modes for Instruction" in James MacDonald (Ed.) Theories of Instruction. Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Publication, 1965.

MacDonald, James B. and Clark, Dwight. "Critical Value Questions and the Analysis of Objectives and Curriculum" in Robert M. Travers (Ed.) Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1973. pp. 405-412.

Maddi, Salvatore. Personality Theories: A Comparative Analysis. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1972.

Mann, J. "Curriculum Criticism." Teachers College Record 71: 27-40; 1969.

Mischell, Walter. "Toward a Cognitive Social Learning Reconceptualization of Personality." Psychological Review 80:252-283; August, 1973.

Nuthall, Graham, and Snook, Ivan. "Contemporary Models of Teaching" in Robert M. Travers (Ed.) Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1973. pp. 47-76.

Popham, James W. and Baker, Eva. Establishing Instructional Goals. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1970.

Rogers, Carl. Freedom to Learn. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company, 1971.

Rueckert, William H. Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1963.

Skinner, B. F. Beyond Freedom and Dignity. New York: Vintage Books, 1971.

Staats, Arthur W. "Behavior Analysis and Token Reinforcement in Educational Behavior Modification and Curriculum Research" in Carl E. Thoresen (Ed.) Behavior Modification In Education. Seventy-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1972. pp. 195-229.

Thoresen, Carl E. "Behavioral Humanism" in Carl E. Thoresen (Ed.) Behavior Modification in Education. Seventy-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1972. pp. 385-421

Tyler, Ralph W. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Westbury, I. "Curriculum Evaluation" Review of Educational Research 40: 239-60; 1970.

Wilson, L. Craig. The Open Access Curriculum. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Zifferblatt, Steven M. "Behavior Systems" in Carl E. Thoresen (Ed.) Behavior Modification in Education. Seventy-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1972. pp. 317-350.